

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

52

23rd July, 1960COCOM Document 3715.01/9 BCOORDINATING COMMITTEERECORD OF DISCUSSIONONITEM 1501: COMMUNICATION, NAVIGATION, DIRECTION FINDING AND RADAR EQUIPMENT18th July, 1960

Present: Belgium (Luxembourg), Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, United Kingdom, United States.

References: COCOM Documents 3715.01/1 to 8.

1. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that they had agreed to hear in the course of the present meeting the views of Member Governments on the changes proposed by the French Delegation in paragraph 1 of COCOM Document 3715.01/8. He invited Delegates to express their Governments' views regarding these changes.
2. The GERMAN Delegate recalled that he had already agreed to the addition of the words "or equivalents" to items A. and B. in the Notes to paragraphs (b) and (e) of Item 1501 and stated that as regards the proposal to exclude D.M.E. equipments from the two Notes proposed by the United States Delegation in COCOM Document 3715.01/4 the German authorities wondered whether D.M.E. equipments really had a higher strategic significance than that of ILS and WOR equipments. In order therefore to avoid discrimination in the case of equipments of United States origin, the German Delegation asked the French Delegation to reconsider their position on this point so that all three equipments might be included in the Notes.
3. The UNITED STATES Delegate stated that his position remained as recorded in paragraph 4 of COCOM Document 3715.01/8.
4. The FRENCH Delegate stated that he would transmit to the competent French authorities the opinion just expressed by the German Delegate on the question of D.M.E. equipments, which was in line with that of the United States Delegation. The Delegate recalled that his Delegation had already stated the reasons which led them to consider D.M.E. equipments as being infinitely more strategic than VOR or ILS equipments.
5. The UNITED KINGDOM Delegate stated that, when the United States proposal had been submitted to the Committee in January, the United Kingdom Delegation had thought it desirable that the exclusion clause should cover VOR, ILS and D.M.E. equipments in the same way. In spite of that fact, the United Kingdom Delegation had thought fit, in order to enable agreement to be reached, to bow to the opinion expressed by French experts by agreeing that this exclusion clause should not affect D.M.E. equipments.
6. In reply to a question by the German Delegate in which he had asked if the United States Delegation could accept the addition of the words "or equivalents" in the event of the French Delegation agreeing to retain D.M.E. equipments in the Notes, the UNITED STATES Delegate stated that this was completely theoretical since the Notes themselves had failed of agreement, and there was little point in considering an additional amendment thereto at this stage; in any event he had no separate instructions on this. Speaking personally, he believed that the phrase "or equivalents" might be insufficiently detailed to provide adequate safeguards.
7. The FRENCH Delegate noted with regret that the Committee were unable to reach agreement on changes in Item 1501 and suggested that discussion be resumed in September.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~